

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 10, 2006 and an Advisory Action mailed April 24, 2006 and is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-12 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,598) in view of Aviani (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,044). Applicants still traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143; see also In Re Fine, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).* Herein, the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest all the claim limitations.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Farber nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest the operation of substituting the Base URI for a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) Base tag within each of the first packets by the personal content directors of at least the first and second local domains. In contrast, Farber teaches a BASE directive, which specifies the resource at the reflector and allows the HTML resource to identify a different base server. *See Col. 16, lines 47-48 of Farber.* The BASE directive differs from the HTML Base tag because the HTML Base tag is used to point to the local domain of a personal content director (PCD). Emphasis added. The Base directive does not provide such teachings.

Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection as applied to independent claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon be withdrawn. For example, dependent claim 4 has been amended to include the limitation that the transmission of the first packets is synchronized through an exchange of time synchronization messages over separate Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection. Such limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

With respect to independent claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Farber nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest transmitting a file and one or more copies of the file to the client for determining which local domain is most proximate to the client, where the transmission is synchronized through an exchange of time synchronization messages over separate Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connections.

Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection as applied to independent claim 12 and those claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,376), Beckerman and Aviani. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because neither Lewis, Beckerman nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest that, all of the limitations set forth in independent claim 19, including the synchronization of the redirect packets through an exchange of time synchronization messages over separate Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connections. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 10, 2006

By

  
William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:*


**MAILING**

**FACSIMILE**

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as  
first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

Date: 05/10/2006

  
Susan McFarlane

05/10/2006

Date